

F 144
T7 W17
Copy 1

TRENTON BARRACKS

34

SKETCH

of the

TRENTON BARRACKS

— New Jersey —

By

Edwin Robert Walker

1911

llc

Presented to the

Congressional Library

By Dr. Carlos E. Godfrey.

90/7

Aug

1st 2013

191

211



THE ABOVE DRAWING REPRESENTS
THE OLD BARRACKS AS THEY WERE
ERECTED IN 1758-9, AND AS
THEY CONTINUED TO EXIST UNTIL
1813. THE COLONIAL HOUSE ON THE
RIGHT WAS THE OFFICERS QUARTERS



THE LOWER PICTURE SHOWS THAT
PART OF THE OLD BARRACKS WHICH
HAS REMAINED ON THE SWISH SIDE
OF TIPPM STREET SINCE THE EXIST-
ENCE OF THAT TIPPMONTHARE THROUGH
THE P. BUILDING S. IN 1813

PRESENTED TO
THE OLD BARRACKS ASSOCIATION
BY
EDWIN ROBERT WALKER
1911.



VICE CHANCELLOR WALKER PRESENTS DRAWING OF OLD BARRACKS TO ASSOCIATION

Reproduction of Original Structure is Made by Art School Man Under Direction of Mr. Walker, Who Also Offers Comprehensive

Historical Sketch

Vice Chancellor Edwin Robert Walker, at a meeting of the Old Barracks Association today, presented to that organization a beautiful drawing of the Old Barracks showing the structure as it stood when first erected, before its partial dismantlement to make way for Front Street.

The drawing was made at Mr. Walker's direction by Henry R. MacGinnis of the School of Industrial Arts. On presenting the picture Mr. Walker offered a comprehensive historical sketch of the famous old building.

The Old Barracks Association is composed of the following ladies:

President, Mrs. J. Murray Forst; vice president, Mrs. John A. Sloan; secretary, Mrs. Harvey M. Voorhees; treasurer, Mrs. Edwin Robert Walker; trustees, Mrs. Henry W. Green, Mrs. Welling G. Sickel, Mrs. Thomas Winans, Mrs. John L. Kuser, Mrs. Frank S. Katzenbach, Sr., Mrs. Cornelius Hook, Mrs. Maria H. Conard, Mrs. John D. Faussett, Mrs. S. Duncan Oliphant, Mrs. Jonathan H. Blackwell, Mrs. James M. Green and Mrs. A. C. Oliphant.

The members are: Mrs. S. C. Allison, Mrs. Josephine Y. Breeze, Mrs. J. H. Blackwell, Miss Clara Blackwell, Mrs. J. C. Bloom, Mrs. W. H. Brokaw, Mrs. William E. Bissell, Mrs. Thomas Craven, Mrs. Charles H. Cook, Mrs. Maria Conard, Mrs. James O. Clephans, Miss Anna L. Dayton, Mrs. William L. Dayton, Mrs. C. B. Dahlgren, Mrs. S. M. Dickinson, Mrs. Edward S. Dunham, Mrs. Daniel J. Bechtel, Mrs. W. Meredith Dickinson, Miss Amy Edwards, Mrs. T. J. Falkenburg, Mrs. J. Murray Forst, Mrs. John D. Faussett, Mrs. A. D. Forst, Mrs. George M. Foster, Mrs. Anna W. Golding.

Mrs. Elmer E. Green, Mrs. Henry W. Green, Mrs. James M. Green, Mrs. J. F. Godley, Mrs. Barker Gummere, Mrs. Cornelius Hook, Mrs. John R. Hill, Mrs. Hugh H. Wilson, Mrs. Alexander F. Jamieson, Miss S. L. Kean, Mrs. John L. Kuser, Mrs. F. S. Katzenbach, Sr., Mrs. William C. Lawrence, Mrs. Alfred W. Lawshe, Mrs. Watson H. Linsburg, Miss Mary M. Moore, Mrs. Henry C. Moore, Mrs. N. R. Montgomery, Mrs. Owen Moon, Jr., Mrs. R. C. Manning, Mrs. R. C. Maxwell, Mrs. S. D. Oliphant, Mrs. Alexander C. Oliphant, Mrs. John W. Pinkham, Mrs. A. A. Post, Mrs. James E. Pope.

Mrs. Washington Roebling, Mrs. Irwin W. Rogers, Miss Mary Richey, Mrs. Elmer H. Rogers, Mrs. James F. Rusling, Mrs. William S. Stryker, Mrs. E. Mercer Shreve, Mrs. W. G. Sickel, Mrs. J. A. Sloan, Mrs. C. L. Traver, Mrs. W. J. Taylor, Mrs. Joseph Thompson, Mrs. Robert Trenbath, Mrs. H. M.

Voorhees, Mrs. E. R. Walker, Mrs. Thomas Winans, Miss Sarah Wood, Miss Ellen P. Wood, Mrs. George B. Yard.

The Vice Chancellor's sketch accompanying the drawing follows:

To the Old Barracks Association, Trenton, New Jersey, Mrs. J. Murray Forst, President.

Dear Madame—Ever since the unveling of the tablets at the Old Barracks on June 20, 1909, in which ceremonies I had the honor to participate, I have thought that your Association should be in possession of a picture of the structure as it stood when first erected and before its partial demolition by the opening of Front Street, westerly from Willow Street, and the conversion of the northerly wing running eastward into dwelling houses. A fact not hitherto generally known and concerning which the belief has been both ways, is, that the old Colonial stone and brick dwelling house on the northwest corner of Front and Willow streets was part and parcel of the original Barracks and was the officers' quarters. My idea of the desirability of the Association having a picture of the historic structure has crystallized into practical form, and I have had an accurate drawing of it made by Mr. Henry R. MacGinnis, of the School of Industrial Arts, which drawing I herewith present to the Association, and beg its acceptance at their hands. The picture as you will notice exhibits the Barracks as they originally stood, and also shows the portion still standing, now owned and preserved by your Association.

On this occasion it seems to me fitting that some account of the historic old structure should be given that it may be preserved in concrete form and save trouble hereafter to those who would explore the various sources of information which I have examined in order to write a succinct and veritable history of these Barracks. Therefore, with your leave, I will now proceed to an account of this matter, pointing out the source of authority for every fact disclosed, that it may be easily verified.

The reason for the building of the Barracks was set forth in my address on the occasion of the tablets ceremonies, in which I said: For a time preceding the year 1757, the war cry of the allies of France was heard upon the then frontier of our country; in parts now accessible in a few hours by our modern methods of transportation, but then remote. Borne of their fears, the desire of the colonists that suitable protection be afforded against the expected incursions of the savage Indians, found expression in petitions to the Legislature for the erection of barracks, in which to house the troops of Britain and of the colony, mobilized for defensive purposes, and at the same time to ease the burden of supporting soldiers quartered in the houses of the

inhabitants of the petitions the Legislature made an appropriation for the erection of these very Barracks among others and they stand today, if not the only certainly the best preserved, of the defensive fortresses built in 1757-1758.

I should have stated that a portion of the Barracks stood as originally erected. I now know that they are the only ones standing in anything like their pristine condition.

In the winter of 1757, a petition was sent to the general assembly of the Providence by magistrates, freeholders, and inhabitants of the town of Trenton, and other places adjacent in the county of Hunterdon, which recited:

That altho we your Petitioners do with truly Loyal and grateful Hearts acknowledge how much we owe to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and his Parliament, for furnishing us with repeated supplies of Troops at this Critical Juncture of Affairs when our all is threatened and endangered by our Inveterate and Potent Enemy, in Conjunction with surrounding nations of cruel and deceitful Savages. And altho we are cheerfully willing to exert the utmost of our power to render these his Majesties Troops perfectly useful, and to answer the just end for which they were designed, in proportion to the number that shall from time to time fall to our share to support: Yet such is the Scituation of Trenton being so great a thoroughfare, and consequently so many soldiers continually passing and repassing upon their Several Commands, and Quartered upon us Night and day, that unless by the Assistance of this Honorable House we can by some wholesome Law and legal Remedy be eased of this present Distress, the Country will be no longer able to bear the Burden, nor the Officers have it in their Power to keep their straggling Soldiers under due Command and Subjection.

"We shall not take upon us to dictate to this Honourable House what should be the method of this Remedy, but hope we may presume to offer our Sentiments, that if we could be provided with convenient Barracks, it would answer all ends both as to the convenience and safety that would redound to the Troops, as well as the great ease and advantage it would be to the Subject.

"We therefore your Petitioners Humbly request that this Honourable House would speedily take it into Consideration and enable us to erect and Build such sufficient and Convenient Barracks for the purpose aforesaid or to give us such other adequate Remedy, in such Measure, and with such Power & Authority, and with such Clauses, Proviso's and restrictions as to this Honourable House, in their wisdom shall think meet and fit.

"And your Petitioners as in duty Bound shall ever Pray, &c."

This petition was signed by persons many of whom have descendants now living in Trenton and vicinity, and I believe it will be of interest to have the signers' names fully copied and set out. For convenience I have arranged them alphabetically. They are as follows:

| | |
|---------------------|---------------|
| Alex Anderson | Aza'h Hunt |
| John Anderson | Willson Hunt |
| Josiah Appleton | Neal Leviston |
| Charles Axford, Jr. | Thomas Moore |
| Daniel Bealergeau | W. Morris |
| Benj. Biles | Edward Paxton |
| Edman Beakes | Chas. Pettit |
| Jno. Barnes | Jos. Phillips |
| Gideon Bickordike | David Price |

William Ball
Thomas Barnes
Wm. Cleayton
Alex. Chambers
John Chambers
Thomas Coalman
Ahra Cottman
James Cumine
George Davies
Jos. De Cou
William Dougless
William Ely
Jonathan Furman
Moore Furman
Jos. Higbee
Richard Hoff
Michael Houdin
Hezekiah Howell
Obadiah Howell

There are 29 petitions of similar character on file in the military records of the State. (The Old Barracks at Trenton, New Jersey, by Adjutant General William S. Stryker, 1855, pages 4 and 5.)

On March 31, 1758, at a session of the colonial legislature at Burlington, the above mentioned petition of the magistrates, freeholders and inhabitants of the city of Trenton was presented to the house, setting forth the great inconvenience they lay under for want of barracks and praying that barracks might be provided for, was read and referred to the committee on the bill for that purpose. It was ordered by the house that the following members, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Yard, Mr. Read, Mr. Paxson and Mr. Leaming, be a committee to prepare a plan of the manner and an estimate of the expense of building barracks for 1,500 men and lay the same before the house. The above named committee on the same day made the following report:

"We the Committee appointed to consider of a Plan for building Barracks for 1,500 Men; and computing the Expences thereof, do hereby report, that we are of Opinion, it will be proper to build one at BURLINGTON, for 300 Men; one at TRENTON, for 300 Men; one at BRUNSWICK, for 300 Men; one at AMBOY, for 300 Men; one at ELIZABETH-TOWN, for 300 Men. And it appearing to us, that the Expense of Building will very much vary, according to the Place where the Building is erected; And that it may be necessary also to vary the Method of Building in several Places, the Expence and Method are therefore both too uncertain for us to form any tolerable Estimate: Our Opinion therefore is, that the best Method the House can fall upon, will be to appoint three responsible Freeholders in each of the above Places, and to impower any two of them to draw on the Treasury for any Sum not exceeding £1,400, for BURLINGTON; nor the sum of £1,400, for TRENTON; nor the sum of £1,400, for NEW BRUNSWICK; nor the sum of £1,400, for AMBOY; nor the sum of £1,400, for ELIZABETH-TOWN; and with the monies so received, to complete the said Buildings, in the most cheap, expeditious and convenient Manner they are capable of. All which is, nevertheless, submitted to the House by

Charles Read,
Aaron Leaming,
Henry Paxson,
Joseph Yard."

The report was unanimously agreed to and it was ordered that the following members, Mr. Smith, Mr. Nevill, Mr. Read, Mr. Fisher and Mr. Yard be a committee to bring in a bill for

Andrew Reed
Clothworthy Reed
John Rickey
James Rutherford
Rob't Rutherford
Vincent Runyan
Theo. Severns
Rob't Scarff
Hezekiah Stout
James Stout
George Tucker
Samuel Tucker
Samuel Tucker, Jr.
John Vaneleave
J. Warrell
Thomas Williams
Jethro Yard
John Yard
Wm. Yard



VICE CHANCELLOR WALKER.

building barracks for quartering soldiers. (Minutes of Assembly 1758, pages 12 and 13.)

On Friday, April 7, 1758, Mr. Smith from the committee brought in a bill for the building of barracks which was read and ordered to a second reading. On Saturday, April 8, 1758, the engrossed bill entitled, "An act for building of Barracks within this Colony, and for preventing spirituous Liquors being sold to common Soldiers without leave from proper Authority, and for other purposes therein mentioned," was read and passed and it was ordered that Mr. Nevill and Mr. Read carry the bill to the Council (now the Senate) for concurrence. On Thursday, April 15, 1758, a message was received from the Council by Mr. Ashfield acquainting the house that they had passed the bill for building barracks within this colony, &c., without amendment. (Minutes of Assembly 1758, pages 19 and 23.)

On Saturday, April 15, 1758, Governor John Reading came into the Council and having by the secretary required the attendance of the House of Assembly, the Speaker with the House attended: "When His Honour was pleased to Give his Assent to the Bill Entituled an Act for Building of Barracks within this Colony," &c. (Journal of the Provincial Council, N. J. Archives, vol. 17, p. 165.)

The act thus passed provided that the treasurers of the colony pay unto Hugh Hartshorn, Thomas Scattergood, William Skeels, John Allen, Joseph Yard, Theophilus Severns, Reuben Runion, Henry Fisher, Joseph Mount, Samuel Nevill, Thomas Barton, John Smyth, Robert Ogden, Cornelius Hatfield and Jacob Dehart, such sum or sums of money, as they might think necessary for erecting and building barracks sufficient to contain three hundred men, at each of the respective places of Burlington, Trenton, Perth Amboy, New Brunswick and Elizabeth-Town, together with necessary conveniences; and further that Andrew Johnson, James Huude, Richard Salter, Robert Lawrence, Charles Read, William Morris, John Johnson,

Ebenezer Miller and Richard Smith were appointed trustees for the colony of New Jersey in whose names the respective deeds of the grounds should be taken, to and for the use of barracks for the quartering of soldiers whenever they might be sent by proper authority to reside in any of the places named.

General Stryker informs us that soon after the passage of the above mentioned act the ground at the west end of Front Street where the river road (which is now State Street, turning south through what is now Willow Street), was purchased from Mrs. Sarah Chubb, whose father, Joseph Peace, purchased the lot in a tract of 36 acres from James Trent, son of William Trent, and that the erection of the Barracks was commenced on May 21, 1758 (The Old Barracks, &c., pages 10, 11 and 12). This deed appears never to have been recorded. I made a diligent search for it in the office of the Secretary of State where deeds were recorded at that time, with the assistance of Frank Tranuse, Esq., and Mr. Charles S. Aitkin, of that office, but was unsuccessful. Though barracks were built in pursuance of the act in all of the places provided for, namely, Burlington, Trenton, Perth Amboy, New Brunswick and Elizabeth-Town, only the deed for the Burlington barracks, dated June 3, 1758, appears to have been recorded (Book of Deeds, vol. "O," page 290, Secretary of State's office).

The committee of the Provincial Assembly were quite right in their surmise that the expenses of building would very much vary according to the place where the building was to be erected, as I find in the minutes of Assembly (1760, pages 52, 54), that the barracks at Perth Amboy cost £1,055 2-7; at Burlington, £2,643 9-2; at Elizabeth-Town, including furnishing, £3,589 7-8½; at Trenton, £1,040-14-2, plus £2,446-6-9, there being a record of two payments with reference to our Barracks.

The building of the Trenton Barracks was pushed so rapidly that more than one-half of them were filled with soldiers in December 1758, and they were fully completed in March 1759. In October 1759, the Barracks were occupied by a regiment of Highlanders whose peculiar dress created much interest among the people of the town. (The Old Barracks, &c., page 12.)

We come now to the interesting question of the old colonial house on the northwest corner of Front and Willow streets. General Stryker says that in December 1759 a small addition was built to the Barracks for the use exclusively of the officers in charge of the English troops. (The Old Barracks, &c., page 12.)

The Barracks, as you know, were erected in the form of three sides of a hollow square, the main building running north and south with two wings, one at the northerly end and the other at the southerly end, both extending eastward. General Stryker says it was built entirely of stone, undressed, two stories in height, the main building 120 feet in length and 18½ feet in width, with two wings each 55 feet in length. The time between the completion of the Barracks in March 1759, until December, when the addition for the officers was built, and when the building must have resembled the only pictures of it which have ever been published, namely, three sides of a hollow square with wings of equal dimensions, is a period of months only, after which time until the partial demolition of the building for the opening

of Front Street the appearance of the building must have been unchanged and included the officers' quarters, which were, in fact, the colonial house on the northwest corner of Willow and Front Streets. I assume that General Stryker was correct when he says that the officers' quarters were built in December, 1759, although he does not disclose the source of this authority, nor does he mention the colonial building as being those quarters. He doubtless assumed that that was a fact known to those who were conversant with local history. However, in the twenty-six years that have elapsed since his pamphlet was written, this fact, if ever generally known here, has been practically buried with the older inhabitants who have passed away and is almost entirely unknown to the living Trentonians of today. I was able to find only one person who could assure me of the historical fact that this building was the officers' quarters and part and parcel of the Barracks built in 1759, and that was Miss Emettine R. Johnston, of 124 West Front Street, whom I interviewed last August (1910). Miss Johnston was then nearly 89 years of age, and in full possession of her faculties. She told me her family moved into this very house in 1836, when she was in her fifteenth year and that she and her sister resided in the house until the time of the war of the rebellion when she left and her sister, who is now deceased, continued to reside there many years afterwards. Miss Johnston informed me not only that she had always understood that the old house was part of the Barracks and occupied by the British officers, but that a daughter of Conrad Kottz, who lived on the west side of South Warren Street between State Street and Front Street during the revolutionary war (See General Stryker's Trenton 100 Years Ago, page 11), and who was 16 years old at the time of the battle of Trenton, and who when a widow by the name of Robinson (whose first name she had forgotten, but who went by the name of "Aunty" Robinson), called upon the Johnston family in 1836, when they first moved into the old house, and in conversation told them that the house in which they were living was standing there during the Revolutionary War and was occupied by the officers in command of the troops quartered in the Barracks. Miss Johnston also informed me that when she lived in the house there was an iron plate in the fireplace in the kitchen about one yard square, with the British coat-of-arms upon it, the lion and the unicorn being distinctly remembered by her. Many of the older people of Trenton are acquainted with Miss Johnston and knew her sister, and will remember the private school which they conducted in the old house for several decades.

Now, the information imparted to me by the venerable and respected Miss Johnston is, it seems to me, perfectly conclusive of the question under examination. Here is a person who tells us that the old house was the officers' quarters at the Barracks, not because of tradition handed down to her for several generations, but by testimony received first-hand and from the lips of one who was practically a contemporary of the building. Furthermore, doubtless no one would have installed an iron plate bearing the British coat-of-arms in that house soon after the Revolutionary War, the feeling against England being intense for many years after the close of the conflict. Again, undoubtedly the house would not have been built where it is as a residence, disassociated from the Barracks, until

after Front Street had been opened, as, before that time the Barracks' lot was entire and in the ownership of a single individual. However, I did not permit my researches and investigation to end here, but later discovered a piece of evidence which is documentary in character and absolutely conclusive of the fact that the old house was a part of the Barracks. Having learned that Doctor Carlos B. Godfrey, late of the adjutant general's office, had made some researches concerning the Barracks at one time, I told him of the investigation I was making and requested that he give me any information he might have concerning the subject in hand. He very obligingly told me that he had found in the cellar of the State House a ground floor plan of the Barracks which showed the old house as the officers' quarters. Through his kindness I was placed in possession of the plan, or rather plans referred to, for they are in duplicate, one on each side of the same sheet of paper, and I have had them photographed. These photographs I also send you along with this communication, and beg your acceptance of the same. From inspection it would appear that the plans are not the working plans from which the Barracks were built in 1759-9, but that they were made at a later date and for a different purpose, as I will now proceed to show. The French and Indian war ended with the establishment of peace with France in 1763. During the year 1765 the building seem to have been unoccupied and the attention of the General Assembly was called to the fact in May, and they ordered that the perishable articles therein should be sold and the building kept in repair and rented. William Clayton and Abraham Hunt were appointed commissioners to carry out these orders of the Legislature, and they immediately sold the furniture and rented the building and premises, a clause in the lease requiring them to be given up at any time on suitable notice of the Governor that they were needed for the use of British soldiers. (The Old Barracks, &c., pages 12 and 13). Now it will be observed by looking at the photographs of the plans that the building was divided into rooms, which are numbered, and a price set opposite the number of each room. It is obvious that there was no one in Trenton in the colonial period who would for any reason or purpose desire to rent the barracks as an entirety, and therefore it clearly appears that the building was divided into rooms for the purpose of renting to families and others, and this arrangement must have been made in or about 1765 and continued down to 1776. Therefore this plan must have been made not earlier than seventeen years after the erection and completion of the Barracks, and must have been made by a man who was contemporary with the structure and knew when he drew the plans and marked indelibly upon them as he did "officers' house," that he was making a correct drawing and truly stating a fact concerning the colonial mansion on the corner of Front and Willow streets.

Digressing for a few minutes from the examination of data concerning the history of this interesting structure, I desire to bring to your attention an historical incident connected with the Barracks not hitherto published anywhere save in the public records and archives of the State. It consists of the documents laid before a meeting of the Provincial Council in 1767 concerning the reception by the last col-

onial governor, William Franklin, from Earl Shelbourne, one of the secretaries of state of England, of the disallowance of an act passed by the Provincial Legislature in 1766, appointing commissioners for supplying the several Barracks erected in the colony with furniture and other necessaries for accommodating the King's troops in or marching through, the colony, and for defraying other incidental charges. Thus it appears that a matter of importance concerning our historical Barracks, among the others, was passed upon by the King of England and his Privy Council and disallowed, because the act of the Legislature of the colony which was vetoed, flouted an act of Parliament. The full minute of the colonial council on this question is herewith submitted for your perusal because of its interest and because of the illustrious gentleman who sat in judgment, advising the King as to the audacious law of the colony.

"At a Council held at Burlington on Friday the 26th day of November, 1767.

Present

The Honble—Charles Read, John Smith, Samuel Smith—Esqrs. of his Majesty's Council.

His Excellency laid before the Council two letters he had lately received from the Right Honble the Earl of Shelbourne, one of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, dated at White Hall July 18th, 1767, and August 7th, 1767, enclosing the Opinion of the Board of Trade, that an Act of Assembly of this province passed in June, 1766, ought to be disallowed, and his Majesty's Royal disallowance of the said Act, which are in the following words, vizt

To the King's most Excellent

Majesty

We have had under our Consideration an Act passed in your Majesty's Province of New Jersey in June, 1766, and Entituled, "An Act appointing Commissioners for supplying the several Barracks Erected in this Colony with furniture and other necessaries for accommodating the King's Troops in or marching through this Colony, and for defraying other incidental Charges."

Whereupon We beg leave humbly to represent to your Majesty That Whereas the Act of Parliament passed in the fifth year of your Majesty's Reign, for Amending the Mutiny Act, and for rendering it more effectual, in your Majesty's Dominions in America, does direct the Governor and Council of the respective Provinces to appoint Commissioners for furnishing your Majestys Troops with certain necessaries therein Enumerated, and that all the Expenses incurred thereby shall be paid by the said Province respectively, this Law does on the Contrary make the Nomination of the said Commissioners An Act of the General Legislature of the Province referring them not to the Act of Parliament above recited but to the Usage of the Province for the several Articles with which your Majestys Troops are to be supplied and Limiting the Money to be paid by the said Province, on Account of the afoe Service, to the Sum of One hundred Pounds for each of the five Barracks in the said Province.

For these Reasons, as this Act of the Legislature of New Jersey does not make provision either in the Mode, or to the Extent allowed by

the Act of Parliament above referred to, We do humly recommend it to your Majesty to signify your Royal disallowance of this Act.

Which is most humbly submitted
Whitehall
May 8th 1767.

Clare
Geo: Rice
Wm Fitzherbert
Thos Robinson,
At a Court at St. James's the 18th
day of May 1767.
Present

(Seal of the
Privy
Council)
The Kings Most Excellent
Majesty

His Royal High- Earl of Har-
ness court
the Duke of York Earl of Ilchester
ArchBishop of Canterbury Earl of Besbor-
ough
Earl of Hillsbor-
ough
Lord President Earl of Shel-
burne
Duke of Bolton Viscount Fal-
mouth
Duke of Queens- Viscount Bar-
bury
Duke of Argyle Viscount Clare
Marquis of Granby Bishop of Lon-
don
Lord Steward Lord Berkley of
Stratton
Lord Chamber- Lord Bathurst
lain
Earl of Denbigh Lord Sandy
Earl of Shaftes- Mr. Treasurer of
bury the Household
Earl of Litchfield Jas Stuart Mc-
Kenzie Esqr
Earl of March- Wellsbore Ellis
mont Esqr
Earl of Bristol Sir Gilbert Elliot
Master of the
Rolls

Whereas by Commission under the Great Seal of Great Britain, the Governor Council and Assembly of his Majesty's Province of New Jersey are authorized and impowered to make, Constitute and Ordain, Laws, Statutes and Ordinances, for the publick Peace, Welfare and good Government of the said Province; which Laws, Statutes and Ordinances are to be, as near as conveniently may be, agreeable to the Laws and Statutes of this Kingdom, and to be transmitted for his Majesty's Royal approbation or disallowance, And Whereas in pursuance of the said Powers an Act was passed in the said Province in 1766 and transmitted Entitled as follows, vizt

'An Act appointing Commissioners for supplying the several Barracks Erected in this Colony with Furniture and other necessaries for accommodating the Kings Troops in or marching thro' this Colony and for defaying other incidental Charges.'

Which Act having been perused and considered by the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations and by them presented to his Majesty at this Board as proper to be disallowed, his Majesty was thereupon this Day pleased, with the Advice of his Privy Council to Declare his disallowance of the said Act. And pursuant to his Majesty's Royal Pleasure thereupon Expressed, the said Act is hereby disallowed, declared Void and of none Effect Whereof the Governor or Commander in Chief of his Majestys said

Province of New Jersey for the time being, and all others whom it may concern, are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.'

(See Journal of Governor and Council, N. J. Archives, vol. 17, page 459.)

Returning to the subject of our narrative I perhaps cannot better tell of the use and occupation of the Barracks during the Revolutionary War than by here inserting that part of the inscription on the inside tablet above referred to, which covers the revolutionary period, and is as follows:

"For a short time preceding the battles of Trenton and Assumpink it (the Barracks) was occupied by British troops, Hessians, Provincial recruits for the service of the Crown, and Tory refugees, and during the remainder of the war by troops of the Continental Line, State Militia and their French Allies."

For three years after the war of the revolution the Barracks were disused, and on June 1, 1786, the Legislature directed the commissioners of this State to sell all the barracks and lands attached to them. (The Old Barracks, &c., page 14).

By deed dated February 18, 1787 (Hunterdon County clerk's office, volume 1 of deeds at page 222), Moore Furman, one of the commissioners for the State sold the Trenton Barracks to William Ogden and William Patterson. Moore Furman was a distinguished Jerseyman of the late colonial and early state epochs. He was Deputy Quarter Master General of the New Jersey State Troops during the Revolutionary War and was an all round man of affairs. One of his descendants was the late Capt. William E. Hunt, of the United States Navy, and his present day descendants in Trenton are of the families of Green, Hillson and McIlvaine. Some five years after he sold the Barracks as Commissioner for the State, Moore Furman acquired the property individually by conveyance from William Ogden and William Patterson and their wives, by deed dated March 30, 1792 (Hunterdon County clerk's office, volume 1 of deeds, page 661). The old Barracks and their grounds have at all times since the last mentioned date been owned by private individuals, first in their entirety, and afterwards in divided form.

In the course of my investigation I endeavored to ascertain the exact date of the demolition of that part of the Barracks through which Front Street was extended when opened westward from Willow Street to Delaware Street. General Stryker in his "Old Barracks at Trenton," page 14, says that this was done in the year 1813. I endeavored to ascertain the exact date in 1813, and the source of authority for the extension of Front Street, and with the assistance of Mr. Harry B. Salter, city clerk of Trenton, I examined all the records of common council for that year (1813) but found nothing relating to Front Street. With the aid of Mr. Abram Swan, Jr., city engineer, I examined the old atlases and maps in his office, but we could find nothing bearing on the question. Mr. John D. Faussett, assistant state librarian, very kindly examined the files of the newspapers covering every period during which the street may have been opened, so far as any statement recorded in print seemed to indicate, but found nothing on the subject. I desire to make my acknowledgements to Mr. Faussett for further

and other assistance in making research concerning the matter treated of in this article.

In Raum's History of Trenton, at p. 271, it is said that Front Street was continued to the State House yard directly through the Old Barracks in 1801, making two separate buildings of it instead of one as theretofore.

This diversity of dates between Gen. Stryker and Mr. Raum perplexed me, and I undertook by a search of the records for conveyances both here and at Flemington, Hunterdon County, for you know that Trenton was in Hunterdon until Mercer County was formed in 1838, to ascertain when lots were first conveyed on Front Street including any part of the old Barracks, in the hope and expectation of finding that the street was laid out as a private enterprise by the owner of the entire tract, and not by virtue of any public authority, and thus, approximately at least, to ascertain the date of its opening. In this I was disappointed, as a break in the record title occurs between the years 1792 and 1815. The last recorded conveyance of the Barracks lot to any one was that to Moore Furman in 1792, above mentioned. The next conveyance of any part of the premises was in 1815, and is made by the heirs of Samuel W. Stockton. There is no conveyance of record here or at Flemington showing any divestiture of title out of Moore Furman or any devolution of title upon Samuel W. Stockton. I am indebted to John T. Temple and Alexander Trapp, Esqs., lawyers, of this city, for most extensive and laborious searches of the records at Trenton and Flemington with regard to this matter. They, however, found that in 1793 the surveyors of the highway under and by virtue of proceedings in the Hunterdon County Court of Common Pleas laid out Front Street westerly from Willow Street to the State House lot as a highway, the lines of which passed through the Old Barracks. This is perfectly apparent from the beginning point of the new road, and its course as described in the return of the surveyors, corresponding as it does with the courses in deeds of lands bordering on the street. A copy of the return taken from Road Book "A," Hunterdon County, page 187, is as follows:

"Road fr. ye end of
Front Street in)
Trenton to ye State
House Lot, &c.)

We the Surveyors of the Highways of the Townships of Trenton, Maidenhead & Hopewell, being legally called by order of the Inferior Court of Common Pleas for the County of Hunterdon to lay a road fr. the end of Front Street in the City of Trenton to the State House Lott, & we after viewing the premises & hearing the allegations of all parties do agree to lay a road forty-two feet wide as follows: Beginning at the end of Front Street aforesd. near the Barracks from thence running in the middle of the Road North seventy degrees west, four chains & seventy links to the State House Lott, thence North twenty-two degrees East, three chains & forty-nine links out into the road that leads from Abrm Hunt's to Beatty's ferry and that the said road be opened on or before the first day of September next.

And we the said Surveyors being also called by the aforesd order to vacate a certain Alley running between the Lotts of Abr. Appleton & Isaac Peace, and we do agree

to take up & vacate the s'd alley as follows. Beginning at the end of said Alley at the Southeast corner of said Abr. Appleton's Lott & we do agree to take up & vacate the same until it intersects the afo're new road. In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands & seals May 27th, 1793.

John Riggs, (L. S.)
Israel Moore, (L. S.)
Theophilus Phillips (L. S.)
John Stevens, (L. S.)
Andrew Smith, (L. S.)
John Temple, (L. S.)

Recorded May 28th, 1793."

Notwithstanding the laying out of the road to be opened on or before September 1, 1793, it seems not to have been accomplished in fact, at least not through the Barracks building, until 1813, although portions of Front Street were certainly opened between Willow and Delaware Streets prior to that year, because by a deed made in 1809 property was conveyed on the lower side of Front Street, east of the Barracks, one line of which ran to the "Barracks lot," and by a deed made in 1811 property was conveyed on the north side of Front Street by a line running from Delaware Street westerly about eighty feet which, of course, did not extend east as far as the "Barracks lot" proper. In view of these facts, and others which will be hereafter mentioned, I am of the opinion that General Stryker was right in his assertion that the street was actually opened through the Barracks in 1813, because: (1) he was an eminent historical authority; (2) he wrote his account 26 years ago and had better facilities than I, at least traditionally, and probably documentary, to enable him to ascertain the fact; (3) Mr. Raum was not as thorough and accurate as General Stryker. What prececces Mr. Raum's assertion that Front Street was opened west of Willow Street in 1801 is this: he says the buildings known as White Hall (Old Barracks) were erected by the King as barracks for his officers. This we know is a mistake. The King never erected the Barracks, nor was his permission even asked. They were erected exclusively by the colony and maintained for its defence. True, they housed the soldiers of the King, but were not built exclusively for officers. Then again, in describing the building Mr. Raum says it commenced at Willow Street, extended west toward the State House, thence ran south crossing Front Street, thence taking an easterly direction terminated again at Willow Street, forming three sides of a hollow square. As Front Street, by his own assertion, was not opened until 1801, the Barracks running south in 1758 could not have crossed that street, unless he means they crossed what is now Front Street. The description, if not inaccurate, is certainly loose. Therefore I say that General Stryker's date should be given the preference, and as no information is obtainable showing any other date at the time of the actual demolition of the walls of the building to admit of the extension of Front Street, that year, 1813, should, I think, unhesitatingly be accepted as the true date of the event.

It must be a source of pride to Trenton that the Barracks here are the only ones of the five erected that are preserved in anything like original form and appearance. I have made inquiry of gentlemen living in the other cities where barracks were erected, namely, former Chancellor Magle of Elizabeth,

Captain James Parker of Perth Amboy, Mr. Henry S. Haines of Burlington, surveyor general of West New Jersey, and Mr. William H. Benedict of New Brunswick, and learn from them that the old barracks in their respective towns are totally demolished, with one exception and that is in Burlington where but fragments of the original structure remain. These remnants of barracks are incorporated into St. Paul's Catholic Church and Parochial School, Burlington. They consist of the extreme end of the wings of the barracks, one being the rear portion of the church and the other the rear of the school. The barracks there, unlike those at Trenton, were built of brick instead of stone. Mr. Francis B. Lee and I visited Burlington and inspected the remains of its barracks in company with Mr. Henry S. Haines, during the month of December last (1910). Mr. Lee gave it as his opinion that the reason the Burlington barracks were built of bricks was because bricks were manufactured in that locality at that time and no stone quarries existed in the neighborhood. At Trenton, as we know, there are numerous quarries, one or more of which were open in pre-revolutionary days.

Besides the old mansion on the corner, that part of the Barracks which was the north wing proper is now incorporated into the three dwelling houses to the west of the mansion, being Nos. 106, 108 and 110 West Front Street. The two houses adjoining the mansion are under the original Barracks' roof as plainly to be seen by a mere inspection, and by comparison with the roof on the old building which is intact on the south side of the street. The most westerly house is extended several feet into Front Street and built above the original Barracks roof. The lower west wall however, of this building and the rear walls of all of them are of the original structure of 1758.

It will be noticed by even a casual observer that the front wall of the mansion and the two adjoining houses on the west are of brick instead of stone, and the question arises: were the buildings thus constructed originally, or were they altered at or after the time of the extension of Front Street? Mr. Jules S. Ferriol, a mason builder of this city, at my request made a careful inspection of these buildings and gives it as his unqualified opinion that the brick walls were not originally incorporated in them, but were put in afterwards. This, coupled with General Stryker's assertion that the building was "entirely of stone," seems to abundantly show that the brick walls must have been of later origin than the structure itself. Another evidence that the brick walls were put in at or after the alteration of the Barracks is this: When the change was made a new front wall had to be supplied to the most westerly part of the building on the north side of Front Street, and the wall when built extended into the street on a line with the officers' quarters on the east, leaving the intermediate building a few feet back in recess, as the two houses composing it exist today. The front of the most westerly house wall was of brick.

Maj. Samuel S. Armstrong has informed me, and says he well remembers his father, the late Horatio G. Armstrong, covering it with stucco and raising the roof another story in the year 1863.

My theory is that when Front Street was extended and the north wing of the Barracks including the officers' quarters was detached and turned into

residences, the brick walls were pulled the fronts by the then owner or owner to give them a more modern appearance and to dissociate them as much as possible from the old Barracks, which they had been an integral part, little dreaming that that association would be a desideratum in future generations.

A matter barely mentioned, which is of interest, is the fact the Barracks have been known to some extent as White Hall. Referenced them by that name is to be found frequently in old conveyances. Loss in his Field Book of the Revolution, vol. 2, page 244, makes mention of the building by that name and presents a sketch of it made by himself when on his visit to Trenton in search of historic data in the year 1849.

Some of the pictures of the Old Barracks that have heretofore appeared have shown it with plain walls running from the ground to the overhanging eaves of its roof, and some have shown it with a balcony between the first and second stories on the inner sides of the square. That the balcony existed is the most cogent proof. A glance at the walls facing north and east of the detached portion on the south side of Front Street will disclose the ends sawed off joists on a line with the second floor. These joists are close together and thus gave the balcony great strength, which was required. The fact, coupled with the pictures which amount to corroborating evidence, establish, beyond doubt the fact of the existence of the balcony in the early days of the structure, and, therefore, have had the balcony incorporated in the drawing which I send you. Another thing: Mr. MacGlinnis, who drew the picture, discovered the exact number of posts that supported the balcony and has correctly reproduced them. Their marks are still visible under the eaves of the remaining building and indicate the entire number originally existing.

Before leaving the subject I desire to express my thanks to Judge Garrison, D. W. Vroom, Francis B. Lee, Esq., and William Nelson, Esq., corresponding secretary of the New Jersey Historical Society, for valuable information and suggestions with reference to the subject of this article.

I will trespass upon your time to expatiate but a single other thought, an one for which I claim no originality, one that has been rather wished than hoped for,—but one that is perfectly feasible, and may some day be accomplished in reality. It is the restoration of the old Barracks to their original condition. Independence Hall, the historic old State House in Philadelphia, has been restored, why not the Barracks at Trenton?

In my address at the unveiling of the tablets I took occasion to remark, that in a humble way it may be said that this building bears something of the same relation to Trenton as does the Tower of London to the historic city of that name. We cannot boast that this stronghold has never fallen into the hands of a foreign foe, as England proudly boasts of her Tower, but we may with pride allude to the fact that within these walls not such frightful scenes of blood and carnage have been enacted as in that gloomy fortress on the banks of the River Thames. With us, quite differently, these bloody scenes of Barracks are associated with hallowed memories of the Revolution.

Think of the possibilities to be derived from a restoration of this historic structure! Within its walls might be instituted an armory, as in the Tower of London, where various weapons used in warfare might be exhibited, especially weapons which are of historic value in themselves. Meetings of patriotic societies could be there held, and innumerable other uses and advantages could be attained. These are but suggestions. This is a fact: If these Barracks were restored they would comprise one of the most, if not the most, historic building in the State of New Jersey! Is this not a matter in which not only the citizens of Trenton but the citizens of the state should take an interest? Are not the old Barracks something for the people of New Jersey to cherish with pride? At least, the Barracks as they now exist will be preserved, and I cannot, I think, more fittingly conclude this article than to again quote from my address at the unveiling of the tablet and say:

If in the calm that succeeded the storm—if during the period that followed the revolutionary struggle—the supporters and defenders of our country, weary of the conflict, turned their hearts and minds to other things, and permitted the ravages of time to obliterate many an object of historic interest, we, their descendants, atone for their sins of omission, and, fired with an unalterable zeal, are resolved, that every remaining relic shall be preserved—a sacred altar! at whose shrine we may worship.

In this spirit these Barracks will be preserved:—preserved in the name of their builders, in the name of their owners:—for all time and for all the people,—a link connecting the martial past with the peaceful present.

Respectfully,

EDWIN ROBERT WALKER,
Trenton, February 6, 1911.

He proves conclusively that the building plans, for enlarging the Capitol on the northwest corner of Front site, is an appropriate time for it to and Willow Streets, and adjoining the make provision for acquiring and reportion of the Barracks standing, on storing the "Old Barracks," the northerly side of Front Street, is the addition which the late General Stryker says was built in December, 1758, to be used as quarters for the officers who were in command of the troops stationed at the Barracks. Trained lawyer that he is, the Vice Chancellor was not content to draw conclusions from tradition, but has fortified every statement with documentary, and what may be regarded as almost contemporary, evidence that is uncontrovertible.

In brief, Mr. Walker shows that the Barracks were built in 1758, and partially occupied in December of that year; that the land and the buildings (including the officers' quarters) cost £3,487, 0s, 11d; that the buildings were entirely of stone and extended across West Front Street; that the northerly end of the building, and the addition used by the officers, are still standing, though considerably changed from their original appearance; that the buildings were successively occupied by British troops, Hessians, Provincial recruits, Tory refugees, by Continental Line, State Militia and their French allies; that the extension of West Front Street was authorized in 1793 but not perfected until 1813; and that the Trenton Barracks are the only ones of the five erected at the same time, that are preserved in anything like original form and appearance.

Mr. Walker's communication bears evidence of long and painstaking investigation, in which he had the assistance of a number of persons to whom he makes acknowledgement. It will dispose effectually of considerable misinformation that the public has gathered concerning Trenton's historic building. His suggestion that the Barracks be restored to their original condition will receive the hearty endorsement of all Trentonians, who will join in the queries: "Is this not a matter in which not only the citizens of Trenton but the citizens of the State should take an interest? Are not the old Barracks something for the people of New Jersey to cherish with pride?"

The State is caring for the Washington's Headquarters building, at Morristown; the Red Tavern, at Haddonfield; buildings at Rocky Hill and Somerville; and has spent considerable money for monuments and tablets to mark historic spots, none of which has so great an interest as the Barracks. Now, when the State is mak-

Trenton Evening Times. FOUNDED 1882

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1911.

"THE OLD BARRACKS."

Vice Chancellor Edwin Robert Walker, in a communication to Mrs. J. Murray Forst, president of the "Old Barracks" Association of Trenton, makes an important and highly interesting contribution to the history of the colonial structure on West Front Street—undoubtedly the oldest building in the city, and one of the oldest in the State. There has never been a question about the date of the erection of the "Barracks," or "White Hall," as it was at one time quite popularly known; but there has been a doubt—as, indeed, there still is—as to the time when Front Street was cut through.

Probably the most interesting part of Mr. Walker's letter is that in which



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 209 318 2